



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/634,766	08/06/2003	Vincent Muniere	Q76546	6869

23373 7590 07/24/2007
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.
SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20037

EXAMINER

AFSHAR, KAMRAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2617

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

07/24/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/634,766

Applicant(s)

MUNIERE, VINCENT

Examiner

Kamran Afshar, 571-272-7796

Art Unit

2617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 June 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed 06/06/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

To Aid the Applicant:

Applicant makes substantially the same argument based on reason(s) as set forth in the previous Applicant Arguments/Remarks filed on 12/11/2006. Applicant argues that Molno does not teach a specific resource allocation and sending a specific resource request. As previously explained, Applicant is respectfully directed to the specific that user dedicated control channels are allocated on an available radio channel resource for control signalling in packet data transfer mode in a packet communication system (See e.g. Page 1, ¶ [0011]-[0012]). More particularly, resources are allocated in the uplink direction from a mobile station to a base station such that a mobile station inherently send control information (i.e. Coding schemes, modulation schemes, specific / different bit rate, EGPRS mode or GPRS mode, etc.), e.g., measurement reports, to the base station in a data communication session. Additionally, resources are allocated in the downlink direction from a base station to a mobile station such that a base station may send control information, e.g., system specific information, to the mobile in a data communication session (See Molno e.g. Pages 1-2, ¶ [0014]) to support control signaling during packet data transfer mode in an GPRS/EGPRS system ongoing data flow. In circuit switched GSM, additional transmission resources are defined for a Slow Associated Control Channel, (SACCH), such that transmission of control information associated with a traffic channel (TCH) (See e.g. Molno Page 1, ¶ [0012]). Therefore, the specific resource allocations are inherently based on for example a different packet or circuit switch mode, specific modulation or coding schemes higher or lower data rate, that are suitable for GPRS / EGPRS mode, (See Molno e.g. Page 1, ¶ [0004]-[000]. To support this, please also see Admitted Prior ART (APA) e.g. Page 3, 12-15) and/or or user data transfer (See Admitted Prior ART (APA), Page 3, Lines 26-29, Generally data transfer by means of a TBF can be data referred to herein as user data or data referred to herein as signaling data, exchanged in the context of higher level protocols, for example the mobility management (MM) protocol, etc.). It is noted that Applicant is not actively

Art Unit: 2617

claiming as how the step(s) of "being operable to generate an allocation of packet mode resources in a downlink direction for user data transfer..... Applicant broadly arguing and/or claiming of the result of "being operable to generate an allocation of packet mode resources in a downlink direction for user data transfer..... Further, Applicant's arguments do not comply with 37 CFR 1.111(c) because they do not clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. Further, they do not clearly show how the amendments avoid such references or rejections. It is noted, Applicant failed to response to the argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e. a specific resource allocation and sending a specific resource request such as **GPRS request or EGPRS request**) are not recited in independent rejected claims 1-2, 14-17 (See e.g. Page 6, Line 15, Page 7, Lines 16-19 & Entire page 4 of Specification). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. Therefore, the previous rejection is maintained per following. Also, in response to applicant's argument that the intended problem solved by the present application is different from the problem sloved by the prior at (i.e. Molno), a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1, 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Art Unit: 2617

Claims 1, 14-15 recite word(s) " being operable to " renders the claim(s) indefinite because the claim(s) 1, 14-15 are not clear as to what are positively claimed.

4. Claims 3-13 are rejected as they are directly and or indirectly depended on rejected claim(s).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1-7, 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Molno (U.S. Pub. No.: 2001/0030949 A1).

With respect to claims 1-2, 14-17, Molno discloses means, a mobile station, mobile radio network equipment, mobile radio system and / or a method of allocating packet mode resources in a mobile radio system (See e.g. EDGE packet data transfer channel, transfer mode, cellular communication system, etc. Pages 1-2, ¶ [0014]) a mobile station inherently sending (See e.g. 41-49 of Fig. 7) different types of packet mode resource requests the mobile station, in accordance with its requirements, one of different types of packet mode resource requests corresponding to different transfer modes (See e.g. GPRS / EGPRS, bit data rate, coding schemes, modulation schemes, bandwidth, circuit switch mode, packet switch mode, different bit rate, high bit rate, delay sensitive, etc., Page 1, ¶ [0004]-[0005]) that it inherently supports (See e.g. Pages 1-2, ¶ [0014])), a mobile station inherently being able to use one or the other of request types (See e.g. See e.g. bit data rate, coding, modulation, bandwidth, circuit switch mode, packet switch mode, etc. Page 1, ¶ [0005]-[0006]) corresponding to transfer modes that it supports, in accordance with its requirements, of signaling data transfer in the uplink direction (See e.g. Pages 12-2, ¶

Art Unit: 2617

[0014]), the signaling inherently being operable to generate an allocation of packet mode resources (See e.g. PSACCH, PTCCH, Page 2, ¶ [0015]) in the downlink direction for user data transfer (See e.g. signaling, signal, Page 1, ¶ [0001]), ¶ [0011], Page 2, ¶ [0014]), the mobile station inherently uses a type of packet mode resource request corresponding to a transfer mode best suited to the requirements of the user data transfer (See e.g. Page 2, ¶ [0014]) and / or including a cause specifying signaling data transfer requirements (See e.g. delay sensitive, Page 2, ¶ [0015]).

Regarding claims 3, 18, 29, inherently Molno discloses different transfer modes supported correspond to different bit rates available (See e.g. high data rates, Page 1, ¶ [0005], data rate over 384 kbps, Page 1, ¶ [0006]).

Regarding claims 4, 19, 30, inherently Molno discloses different bit rates available correspond to different modulation schemes available (See e.g. GMSK modulation, 8PSK modulation, Page 1, ¶ [0005]).

Regarding claims 5, 20, 31, inherently Molno discloses different transfer modes include a General Packet Radio Service (GPRS) mode and an Enhanced General Packet Radio Service (EGPRS) mode (See e.g. Page 1, ¶ [0008]).

Regarding claims 6, 21, 32, inherently Molno discloses one transfer mode best suited to the requirements of user data transfer corresponds to a transfer mode authorizing the highest bit rate (See e.g. high data rates, Page 1, ¶ [0005], data rate over 384 kbps, Page 1, ¶ [0006]).

Regarding claims 7, 22, 33, inherently Molno discloses one transfer mode best suited to the requirements of user data transfer corresponds to the Enhanced General Packet Radio Service (EGPRS) mode (See e.g. page 1, ¶ [0008]).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 2617

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 8-13, 23-28, 34-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Molno (U.S. Pub. No.: 2001/0030949 A1) in view of Hautamaki (U.S. Pub. No.: 2001/0038614 A1), further in view of Ramjee (U.S. Patent 6,842,462 B1).

Regarding claims 8, 23, 34, Molno discloses everything as discussed above in rejected claim 1. However, Molno does not explicitly disclose requirements for transfer of signaling messages in accordance with a mobility management protocol. In an analogous field of endeavor, Hautamaki discloses allocation of resources and /or channels (page 4, ¶ [0028, Lines 15-19) and signaling data transfer (See e.g. signaling diagram of Figs. 2-4), signaling messages in accordance with a mobility management protocol (See e.g. 104 of Fig. 1). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide above teaching of Hautamaki to Molno to signaling data transfer requirements include requirements for transfer of signaling messages in accordance with a mobility management protocol. The motivation comes from Ramjee, so that the mobility management protocol is performed (See e.g. Co. 3, Line 67) to supports registration, authentication, paging, and handoff, a/k/a cell reselection, as well as procedures for channel access to transmit data packets etc. (See e.g. Co. 5, Lines 56-58).

Regarding claims 9, 24, 35, Ramjee discloses signaling messages (See e.g. Co. 7, Line 35, Co. 7, Lines 65-67) include a cell update message sent in the event of cell reselection during a current user data transfer (See e.g. Co. 8, Lines 56-63).

Regarding claims 10, 25, 36, Hautamaki discloses include a paging response message in packet mode prior to a transfer of user data in the downlink direction (See e.g. Page 3, ¶ [0016], 306 of Fig. 3a-3b).

Regarding claims 11, 26, 37, Hautamaki discloses user data transfer includes a transfer of data in accordance with the Transmission Control Protocol (TCP) (See e.g. (TCP) Page 1, ¶ [0006]).

Regarding claims 12, 27, 38, Hautamaki discloses a message used to transmit a type of packet mode resource request that corresponds to a transfer mode best suited to the requirements of a user

Art Unit: 2617

data transfer is the EGPRS PACKET CHANNEL REQUEST message (See e.g. 307 of Figs. 3a, 3c, 3d, and Page 4, ¶ [0032]).

Regarding claims 13, 28, 39 Hautamaki discloses message includes a cause specifying signaling data transfer requirements (See e.g. Different qualities of service specify different delays for the transfer of packets between different ends of the connection, different bit rates, and the number of packets rejected may be different in connections with different qualities of service, Page 1, ¶ [0005]).

Conclusion

8. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
- a) Masseroni (U.S. 7,050,824 B2).
 - c) Jei (U.S. 7,158,495 B2).
 - d) Pecen (U.S. 7,181,223 B1).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to Kamran Afshar whose telephone number is (571) 272-7796. The examiner can be reached on Monday-Friday.

Art Unit: 2617

If attempts to reach the examiner by the telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Eng, George** can be reached @ (571) 272-3984. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **571-273-8300** for all communications.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Kamran Afshar


GEORGE ENG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER